1	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2	FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF GEORGIA
3	MACON DIVISION
4	
5	
6	THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA : : Case No. 5:09-CR-05(HL)
7	VS : July 30, 2009
8	: Macon, Georgia JOHN LEE ANDERSON, III, :
9	DEFENDANT.:
10	SENTENCING HEARING
11	BEFORE THE HONORABLE HUGH LAWSON
12	UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE, PRESIDING
13	APPEARANCES:
14	FOR THE GOVERNMENT: PAUL MCCOMMON, AUSA.  UNITED STATES ATTORNEY'S OFFICE
15	P.O. BOX 1702 MACON, GA 31202-1702
16	FOR THE DEFENDANT: FRANK HOGUE
17	HOGUE & HOGUE, LP 341 THIRD STREET
18	MACON, GA 31202
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	SALLY L. GRAY, CCR, RPR, USCR P.O. BOX 875
24	MACON, GA 31202-0875
25	(478-752-3497)

## PROCEEDINGS

JULY 30, 2009

THE COURT: John Lee Anderson.

4 MR. MCCOMMON: Good morning, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Good morning. Good morning, Mr. Hogue.

MR. HOGUE: Good morning, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Anderson.

THE DEFENDANT: Good morning, sir.

THE COURT: What says the government?

MR. MCCOMMON: Your Honor, there are two objections that have been entered into by the government and by the defendant, but before I address those, there were some victim issues in this case.

Several victims whose images were possessed by Mr.

Anderson had expressed that their victim impact statements be made available for the Court and the U.S. Attorney's Office has contacted them, obtained those victim impact statements, and made those available for the probation office, and I think those were made available for the Court and also to the defense.

So, the government has complied with its obligations as to the victims in this case. There was also one victim who is the victim of what's known as the Misty Series who has an attorney, Mr. James Marsh.

Originally Mr. Marsh had made a request for restitution

```
1
      in this case, and the Court, at the request of the government,
      signed an order to bifurcate the proceedings so that
 2
     restitution could be possibly later addressed by the Court.
 3
     Mr. Marsh withdrew his request for restitution. So that is no
 4
      longer an issue.
 5
             THE COURT: Did you withdraw it in writing?
 6
7
            MR. MCCOMMON: Yes, sir. Yes, sir, we received a
      communication from him that he would not intend to pursue
8
     restitution in this case.
9
10
             THE COURT: Is that a part of the record?
            MR. MCCOMMON: I furnished a copy to probation. I did
11
12
     not make it a copy of the Court's record.
13
             THE COURT: Don't you think it should be in the record?
14
            MR. MCCOMMON: I can do that, Your Honor.
15
            THE COURT: Go ahead.
            MR. MCCOMMON: So that would resolve the victim and
16
     restitution issues.
17
18
             THE COURT: So there are none?
19
            MR. MCCOMMON: There are none.
20
            THE COURT: Do you agree with that, Mr. Hogue?
21
            MR. HOGUE:
                         I do, Your Honor.
22
             THE COURT: Okay. What else?
23
            MR. MCCOMMON: Your Honor, there were two objections
24
     made by the government and by the defense, and they were
25
     addressed by the probation office in the revised presentence
```

report dated June 9th, 2009. So let me address those.

The first is, there was -- in Paragraph 22, there was an enhancement of two levels for distribution, and it was the position of the probation office that there were at least two instances where Mr. Anderson distributed child pornography, and that the enhancement was appropriate because the images in question reflect the sexual exploitation of a minor and that the adjustment is proper. It's the position of the government that this enhancement is not appropriate.

It's the government position that that enhancement should only be used where a defendant distributes child pornography as defined by law, and based upon my viewing of these images and the chats that were involved -- Mr. Hogue came over one day, and we spent three hours together, and I showed him everything -- based on my examination of the evidence, Mr. Anderson did not distribute child pornography as defined by the statute. So therefore the government would not support that two-level enhancement.

Now, certainly in the chats there was discussions of material. There was -- On two instances there was images that involved minors, but the government would not view those images as being child pornography as defined by law. In the government's view, that's what this enhancement is for, for someone who distributes child pornography.

THE COURT: Two parts of it; distribution, and then

```
1
      child pornography?
            MR. MCCOMMON: Yes, sir.
 2
 3
             THE COURT: Do you contend that there was no
     distribution of whatever it was, whether it was child
 4
 5
     pornography or not?
            MR. MCCOMMON: He transmitted images, but --
 6
             THE COURT: Is that distribution?
7
            MR. MCCOMMON: No, sir. It's distribution, but it's
 8
9
      the government's position that that's not -- it was not child
10
     pornography.
11
             THE COURT: Well, again, listen to what I'm saying.
12
     There are two parts here under consideration. One, is
13
     distribution, the other is child pornography.
          Do you contend that there was no distribution of
14
15
     anything, or do you concede that there was distribution, but
16
      it's the government's position what was distributed was not
17
      child pornography?
18
            MR. MCCOMMON: The latter.
19
             THE COURT: Okay. So there was distribution?
20
            MR. MCCOMMON: Yes, sir.
             THE COURT: As either under the statute or under the
21
22
     Guideline 2G2.2(b)(3)(F).
23
            MR. MCCOMMON: There was --
24
             THE COURT: That's what it says here.
25
            MR. MCCOMMON: Yes, sir. There was distribution.
```

1 THE COURT: Okay. So, how is a determination to be made as to whether the matter which was distributed was child 2 pornography? Is the Court required to view it and then make a 3 factual determination? 4 MR. MCCOMMON: Your Honor, if the Court wanted to 5 pursue it to that extent, that's what the Court would have to 6 7 I don't know of any other way than to actually view what was -- what I can do is provide a description to you, if you'd 8 like to see that. 9 10 THE COURT: All right. Let's hear that. 11 MR. MCCOMMON: Your Honor, this is a report that was 12 provided by Special Agent Jalaine Ward of the FBI. This was 13 provided to Mr. Hogue. 14 MR. HOGUE: Yes, it was. 15 THE COURT: And what the next to the last paragraph, 16 where I put a checkmark, would be what she described. (Pause) 17 THE COURT: Under the statute what must a picture show 18 19 to be child pornography? 20 MR. MCCOMMON: Actual explicit sexual conduct or at a minimum, lewd exhibition of the genitals of the child. 21 22 **THE COURT:** What is a lewd exhibition of the child? 23 MR. MCCOMMON: A photograph that focuses on -- that 24 plainly focuses on genitalia of a child. 25 THE COURT: Well, Agent Ward says in this report, she

uses the word "numerous sexually explicit pictures of children." Says "the child is clothed, but her legs are spread open and much of her buttock are exposed." That does not meet the test?

MR. MCCOMMON: Your Honor, based on my view of the images it did not, but that would be the extent of the evidence of distribution, is what you've viewed.

THE COURT: All right. Have you another objection?

MR. MCCOMMON: Yes. As to Paragraph 24 --

THE COURT: Now, that was Paragraph 22?

MR. MCCOMMON: Yes, sir. As to Paragraph 24, there was an enhancement, a five-level increase for possession of more than 600 images, and what the presentence report identifies is 276 images and five video clips. And under the Guidelines each video clip is assumed to be 75 images, so that would total in excess of 600 images.

As a part of the original stipulation, the government and the defense stipulated that the maximum amount of images should be 300, and in order for the Court to understand the reason for that stipulation I need to give a little background.

As is described in the presentence report, this investigation had a bit of a history before it came to the FBI. The defendant's wife discovered the child pornography on the computer. At that time she had private counsel in

relation to, I think, a pending divorce action against her husband. The evidence was originally given to her private counsel.

At some point, the Bibb County Sheriff's Department became involved. They took possession of the evidence. They obtained state search warrants, then they arrested Mr. Anderson, and then after they did all of that, they turned the case over to the FBI.

When the investigation was first presented to the U.S.

Attorney's Office, we made a determination given the hands
that the evidence had gone through, that we were going to only
focus on evidence that we felt was clearly not tainted by the
original handling through the private attorney's office and
through the Bibb County Sheriff's Office.

And our view was to -- clearly, the hard drive of Mr.

Anderson's computer was -- that was not tainted. That

evidence would clearly be admissible, and we focused on what

he possessed on the hard drive of his computer, and that was

the 276 issue images. The five video clips came from a DVD

that was otherwise seized.

So we did not originally count those five video clips that were not on the hard drive of the computer. Does the Court understand what I'm saying?

THE COURT: I understand what you're saying. They came from another source?

MR. MCCOMMON: Well, they came either from a source that was not as clearly not tainted to the U.S. Attorney's Office, or were obtained pursuant to state search warrants that we didn't think were valid. So we confined our count of the images to what was on the hard drive of his computer.

If the Court did include the five video clips, that would not be improper. The Court could do that. But that's the reason for the government's stipulation as to the 300 images and not originally including those five video clips.

If the Court does include the five video clips -- which is going to bump him up to the maximum amount of images under his guideline -- I would want to point out that under this definition any video clip is going to be counted as 75 images, whether that video clip is 2 seconds or up to 5 minutes, and then above 5 minutes, the guideline says the Court upwardly depart in that instance. All the video clips were relatively short, less than a minute.

So I point that out to the Court too for whatever use you want to make in exercising your discretion. So that's the reason for two objections and that's the reason for the position of the government.

THE COURT: All right. Anything else?

MR. MCCOMMON: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Do you have any objections, Mr.

25 Hoque?

MR. HOGUE: Yes, Your Honor. We have made the same two objections that the government makes to Paragraphs 22 and 24 and for essentially the exact same reasons. This case started in April 2006 when the divorce attorney turned over the computer to local authorities. So we reviewed everything in it.

It's been a long, difficult three years now, although the negotiations ended some months ago, and I think what Mr.

McCommon has relayed to the Court is an accurate and fair assessment of the evidence, the admissible evidence, the Fourth Amendment issues that we would have raised, and the assessment of how to count images and how to evaluate distribution. So we make the same two objections for all the reasons that the Court has just heard.

THE COURT: Well, with respect to Paragraph 22, is your position the same as that of the government, that is to say, you concede that there was distribution, but you contend that the material distributed was not pornographic?

MR. HOGUE: Yes. We do take that same position. I will state, in addition to that, it does appear the evidence shows distribution, however, Mr. Anderson does not remember ever distributing images. But that's what it appears the analysis of the computer would reveal. So we have to concede it on that ground. So, yes, our argument is the same, distribution, yes; child pornography, no.

```
1
             THE COURT: Now, with respect to the material in
     Paragraph 22, how many images are involved?
 2
            MR. HOGUE: In the distribution?
 3
             THE COURT: Yes.
 4
            MR. HOGUE: I'm only aware of what's in the report that
 5
     you've just looked at. That says two occasions, I believe.
 6
7
             THE COURT: Well, what it says here is: "Evidence of
     distribution can be found on DVD, DEHQ12. Numerous sexual
8
      explicit pictures of children were sent on January 29th, 2006
9
10
      and February 25, 2006 to Bonerinatl." I guess, that's how --
11
     B-O-N-E-R-I-N-A-T-L. "UID 391040." I don't know what that
12
     means.
13
           "The chat includes conversation about having sexual
      intercourse with an 11 year old. What could be argued to be
14
15
      sexually explicit pictures or child erotica was sent to
16
     Applicant 0002002, UID Code 175945, on March 18th, 2006.
      child is clothed, but has her legs spread open and much of her
17
18
     buttock exposed. There are three pictures of very young
19
     girls, one of which may be sexually explicit."
20
           I can't tell from that paragraph how many pictures are
      involved, how many images.
21
22
            MR. MCCOMMON: Agent Ward is in the courtroom. Do you
23
     have a recollection?
24
             THE COURT: Do you want her to come up and let her
25
     testify?
```

1 MR. MCCOMMON: Yes, sir. THE COURT: Agent Ward, come up and have a seat on the 2 3 stand, please, ma'am. **DEPUTY CLERK:** Do you solemnly swear that your 4 testimony in this case shall be the truth, the whole truth, 5 and nothing but the truth, so help you God? 6 7 THE WITNESS: Yes, I do. **DEPUTY CLERK:** State your name for the court reporter. 8 THE WITNESS: Jalaine J. Ward. 9 10 THE COURT: And you're an FBI agent? 11 THE WITNESS: Yes, sir. 12 THE COURT: All right. 13 JALAINE WARD Witness, having first been duly sworn, testified on 14 15 DIRECT EXAMINATION 16 BY MR. MCCOMMON: 17 Agent Ward, do you have a recollection -- you heard your 18 report read by the Court? 19 Α. Yes. 20 Do you have a recollection of those two instances with Q. 21 the e-mails as to how many images were actually sent as 22 attachments to those e-mails? 23 In reference to the actual report, with the report that 24 you have, there are numerous images that are traded back and 25 forth, some of which are not -- would not be considered

sexually explicit. There are at least two or three referenced in that that went back and forth between John Anderson and the Boner, B-O-N, screen name, that could be considered pornography or sexually explicit. Certainly what was received by John Anderson in that exchange there is explicit child pornography.

There are other trades that went on, and according to the -- not my report, but the CART examiner report, there was evidence of distribution on using the Google Hello Chat line -- Google Hello Website, and I researched some of that, and there are other trades where John Anderson received explicit child pornography.

Again, number of images, I did not count, you know -- did not go into all of the trades and did not count each one, but I looked at two or three specific examples. One was with Virginia Bull, one is with Pilot for Play and one is -- and certainly one is this B-O-N-E-R-N-A-T-I-L, I believe it is, and number of images, specifically, I can't really say, you know, but in this report there's two or three.

MR. MCCOMMON: Your Honor, that was my recollection is I was going to say perhaps 10 or less.

THE WITNESS: Of the exchange with this one website?

MR. MCCOMMON: Yes.

THE WITNESS: Yes, but this is just one. There are other trades and other evidence of distribution.

1 THE COURT: The government has handed me your report. THE WITNESS: Yes, sir. And my report is extracted 2 based on review of the forensic CART examiner, Michael Hammer, 3 which I have with me as well. 4 THE COURT: Now, what does that mean? 5 THE WITNESS: Well, what I'm saying is it's a review of 6 7 the evidence and a review of his report where he indicates in his official report that there's evidence of distribution in 8 the Google Hello website. 9 10 MR. MCCOMMON: Your Honor, we had Agent Hammer, who was the FBI's forensic examiner come down, and he spent a day with 11 12 us here in Macon, and I asked him specifically to show me 13 what, if any, evidence he had of distribution, and he didn't show me anything other than what she identified in her report 14 as being distribution of anything that would be arguably or 15 16 close to the line of being child pornography. 17 THE WITNESS: I did bring examples of the Virginia Bull 18 with me, if the Court wishes to review that. 19 MR. MCCOMMON: Okay. 20 THE COURT: Is that -- Virginia Bull, is that a part of 21 what's mentioned in this paragraph? Do you understand what 22 I'm talking about here? 23 THE WITNESS: Yes, sir. Yes, sir. When I wrote that, 24 I referred to my own review and a CART examiner report that

indicates that there was -- that there is distribution,

```
evidence of distribution, and when I reviewed the Virginia
1
     Bull and the applicant -- there's several screen names --
 2
 3
     B-O-N-E-R-I-N-A-T-L -- then that's where I, you know, reviewed
      the evidence of distribution.
 4
            MR. MCCOMMON: Do you have the photographs with you?
 5
             THE WITNESS: Uh-huh.
 6
7
             THE COURT: Did you think the photographs were
     pornographic?
8
             THE WITNESS: I think there's a couple of them that are
9
10
      considered -- in the Virginia Bull, I certainly think there is
11
     blatant evidence of receipt of child pornography by John
12
     Anderson from Virginia Bull.
             THE COURT: Is that distribution?
13
             THE WITNESS: My understanding is it's sending or
14
     receiving, but I'm not the expert on that.
15
16
             THE COURT: What's the government's position -- What
17
      about that, Mr. Hogue?
18
            MR. HOGUE: Receipt is not distribution.
19
             THE WITNESS: Receipt is not distribution?
20
            MR. HOGUE: Right. I mean, he has it on his computer,
21
      and he's pled guilty to that. He had to have received that
22
      from somewhere. Distribution --
23
             THE COURT: And that's possession?
            MR. HOGUE: Right. Distribution is a different act.
24
25
            MR. MCCOMMON: Your Honor, may I show you an example --
```

```
I think this will --
1
             THE WITNESS: Okay.
 2
      (Counsel Aside)
 3
            MR. MCCOMMON: I'm showing the Court now the
 4
     photographs that were described in the report. Those are the
 5
 6
      actual photographs.
7
      (Counsel Aside)
            MR. MCCOMMON: And, Your Honor, I'll hand to you now
 8
     what Agent Ward has provided. These are photographs that were
9
10
      apparently sent to the individual with the screen name
11
     Boneranatil.
12
             THE COURT: I'm looking here, Agent Ward --
13
            THE WITNESS: Uh-huh.
             THE COURT: -- at two pages. I don't know how to
14
15
      identify them, but each one is -- each is part of a series of
16
     pages.
17
             THE WITNESS: Uh-huh.
18
             THE COURT: This one, the one I'm showing you now says
19
     page one of seven. Can you specifically identify that, that
20
     page?
21
             THE WITNESS: Yes.
22
             THE COURT: Or that group? Tell me what that is.
23
             THE WITNESS: Those are pictures -- the two pictures at
24
      the top, if you'll look at the top, it says those pictures
25
      sent by local user. Those are going to be pictures sent by
```

John Anderson and to Boner -- I don't know how you pronounce that.

THE COURT: Yes. Okay.

THE WITNESS: And then they'll talk about those pictures, and then it goes on to pictures that that individual sent to him. This is screen name Applicant, again local user sending two pictures. These would be the pictures. The send one is questionable. Certainly --

THE COURT: Right. And on this one, the second from the top?

THE WITNESS: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: And so those are the only two images which are the subject of this --

THE WITNESS: No, sir. No, sir, not just -- not the only two. Then there's other -- there is Pilot For Play is mentioned in my report, further down. I don't believe I have that one with me, but that is -- there is an indication of distribution in that one, and then I brought another one with me with Virginia Bull. I'm just trying to put my fingers on it here.

THE COURT: I want to do this. I want to recess this hearing, and I want you and Agent Ward, and possibly Mr.

Hogue, to go through these things and be able to place before me what it is that's referred to in this third paragraph of Agent Ward's report so that these things can be identified.

1 These images, as I understand it, are the images that both the government and the defense concede were distributed, but are 2 3 not child pornography. Is that right? MR. MCCOMMON: Yes, sir. 4 THE COURT: All right. Rather than me trying to sift 5 through, sitting on the bench with Ms. Ward, everything that's 6 7 the subject matter of that paragraph, I would like for you to take the time to reconstruct it and then present it to me so 8 that I can then look at it, if it's not excessively 9 10 voluminous, and I gather that it's not, and possibly determine for myself whether it's child pornography. Can you do that? 11 12 MR. MCCOMMON: Yes, sir. 13 THE COURT: All right. Let me hand these back to you, Ms. Ward, and if you all will do that -- I can keep this for 14 15 the moment -- so let's recess the Anderson hearing, and while 16 they're doing that, we can go on to something else. 17 matter is in recess. You can let me know when you're ready to 18 proceed. 19 MR. MCCOMMON: Are you talking about today? 20 THE COURT: I sure am. 21 MR. MCCOMMON: Okay. 22 (RECONVENED; ALL PARTIES PRESENT) 23 THE COURT: All right. Let's come back to the Anderson 24 case. 25 MR. MCCOMMON: Your Honor, may I ask that Special Agent

```
1
      Ward retake the stand?
             THE COURT: Yes. Be seated, please. All right. Go
 2
 3
      ahead.
                   (CONTINUED EXAMINATION OF JALAINE WARD)
 4
      BY MR. MCCOMMON:
 5
 6
           Special Agent Ward, at my request did you produce a
7
      report of any evidence in this case that would have shown
     distribution by Mr. Anderson of child pornography?
8
           Yes.
9
      Α.
10
      Q.
           And we've previously gone over the report with the Court?
11
      Α.
           Yes.
12
           The Court has had a chance to read it?
13
      Α.
           Yes.
           I want to show you now three exhibits that I believe will
14
15
     be shown to correspond to that report that's previously been
16
      read by the Court. Let me show you Government Exhibit 1, and
17
      can you identify Government Exhibit 1 as three images that
18
      were sent by the defendant to Applicant 002002 on March the
19
      18th, 2006?
20
      Α.
           Yes.
21
             MR. MCCOMMON: Your Honor, I'll publish these to the
22
      Court as I put them in.
23
             THE COURT: Has defense counsel had an opportunity to
24
      look at these?
```

MR. HOGUE: Yes, Your Honor. These are, in fact, the

photographs that were the subject of the negotiations we've addressed in our objection.

THE COURT: All right. Very good. Go ahead.

## BY MR. MCCOMMON:

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

- Q. Special Agent Ward, I'm now going to show what's marked as G-2, or Government Exhibit 2, and can you identify these as images that were sent by the defendant to Boner in Atlanta on February the 25th of 2006, I believe, that was 59 images?
- **9 A.** Yes. 54, uh-huh.
- MR. MCCOMMON: Your Honor, let me publish these to the
  Court. They begin at the bottom of the page, the first page.
- 12 BY MR. MCCOMMON:
- Q. And, Special Agent Ward, let me show you Government

  Exhibit 3, marked as G-3. Can you identify these as 180

  images sent by the defendant to, again, Boner in Atlanta on

  January the 29th, 2006?
- 17 A. Yes.

18

19

20

21

- MR. MCCOMMON: And, Your Honor, I publish these for the Court, and they start at the top of the first page shown.

  Your Honor, that would be the extent of the government's evidence concerning any distribution of arguable child pornography in this case.
- 23 THE COURT: All right. Questions, Mr. Hogue?
- 24 MR. HOGUE: No questions, Your Honor.
- 25 THE COURT: All right. With respect to these exhibits,

```
1
     Agent Ward, which of these pictures in your judgment are
      arguably child pornography, as opposed to just pictures of
 2
      children?
 3
             THE WITNESS: This would be (indicating). This would
 4
     be one in here.
 5
             THE COURT: Let me see, now, this is Exhibit 1. There
 6
     are three pictures on the first page of Exhibit 1.
7
             THE WITNESS: Yes.
 8
             THE COURT: Did you point out any of those pictures?
9
10
             THE WITNESS: Yes, the second one.
            THE COURT: The middle picture?
11
12
             THE WITNESS: Yes.
13
             THE COURT: And then on the second page of Exhibit 1,
      the middle picture of those three?
14
15
             THE WITNESS: Yes. And basically what that second page
16
     is showing --
17
             THE COURT: Well, that's the same picture?
             THE WITNESS: Exactly. It's showing a summary of what
18
19
     was sent by the local user on that second page, and so it
20
     would be the one image.
21
             THE COURT: Okay.
22
             THE WITNESS: And then, this exhibit, it would be --
23
      just making sure -- there's one sent by the user, and then
24
      certainly a couple received (indicating). One sent, that is
25
     the second image on the top line, there.
```

```
1
             THE COURT: All right. I'm going to put an arrow
 2
      there.
             THE WITNESS: Uh-huh.
 3
             THE COURT: This is first -- well, I can't say it's the
 4
      first -- It's marked G-2, and to the right of G-2, it says
 5
     page six of seven, and on that sheet of paper there are three
 6
7
     rows of small photographs, and you are referring to the
     photograph on the top row, which is the second from the left?
8
9
             THE WITNESS: That's right.
10
             THE COURT: Okay. And that's all in G-2?
11
            THE WITNESS: I believe so, yes.
12
             THE COURT: All right. And then G-3.
13
            THE WITNESS: That was sent, yeah.
             THE COURT: G-3, would you identify what photographs
14
     you think are arguably child pornography?
15
16
             THE WITNESS: I don't have --
17
             THE COURT: You know, I think I have the color ones
18
     here in the Court's file. I know I do on some of them.
19
     were part of the probation report to me. It might be better
20
     to use them. They are certainly more -- the black and whites
21
     are kind of grainy.
22
            MR. MCCOMMON: Your Honor, while she's marking that,
23
     may I make a statement?
24
             THE COURT: Yes, sir.
25
            MR. MCCOMMON: I think she's identified photographs, if
```

I heard her correctly, that were received. If this two-level enhancement is appropriate for receipt, then obviously it applies because everything that he has he received. But according to the definition in this Guideline of distribution what he received should not be applicable for this enhancement. I mean, by its very definition in the Guideline, distribution is something he distributes to someone else. If receipt applies, obviously the enhancement would apply, but then there's no need for the enhancement because everything he has he received.

THE COURT: You gentlemen told me before the recess that you agreed that there was distribution. You said you didn't have any quarrel with "distribution." Your opinion was, at least the government's, and, of course, the defense agreed, that the images portrayed, the images distributed were not child pornography --

MR. MCCOMMON: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: -- but that it was a matter in which the Court could inspect the images for itself and make a determination. Do I misstate what was said?

MR. MCCOMMON: No, Your Honor, that's correct.

MR. HOGUE: I think what we're saying is some of what you're being shown is pictures received, not distributed.

MR. MCCOMMON: Not distributed by the defendant.

THE WITNESS: But I'm going to specify the ones that

we're pointing out that were sent, that we agreed on.

MR. HOGUE: Which I understand is the only ones the Court is interested in with respect to this objection.

THE COURT: Well, I'm interested in the pictures which are the foundation for the proposed enhancement.

MR. HOGUE: Right.

THE COURT: -- to which objection has been made.

MR. HOGUE: Yes. And what the government and the defense is saying is that some of these on those pages are not the subject of Paragraph 22 because they were not distributed by Mr. Anderson.

THE COURT: Well, we left here -- you left here with instructions to provide me with exhibits of the materials that had been distributed, but which were contended not to be pornographic.

MR. HOGUE: Right.

MR. MCCOMMON: And --

THE COURT: And with the assumption in my looking at these photographs is that they were distributed. They were distributed, that's what you said, and I said, okay, show me what was distributed so I may make a determination as to whether or not they are pornographic. And that's what I assume we are doing here. Now, if we're not doing that, then we'll stop again and go back to square one.

MR. MCCOMMON: No, Your Honor. That's correct, but the

1 summary reports show not only what was sent to those chat 2 people, but what they sent back, what was received by him. 3 what we have attempted to mark here is just what he would have distributed. 4 5 THE WITNESS: Right. MR. HOGUE: And if I may interject, I believe what I 6 7 did back in the room during the break was looked at the ones that the government marked, and I thought that's what the 8 witness was giving up to the Court just now. And we marked a 9 10 handful of photos on some black and white summary reports. 11 But, now --12 THE WITNESS: If you trust me, Frank, I can label these 13 same three or four that we came up with that were sent, if you 14 want me to put -- I'll put an S by the ones --15 MR. HOGUE: The same ones we just did in the room? 16 THE WITNESS: Yes, sir. 17 MR. HOGUE: I'm fine with that. 18 (Pause-Aside) 19 I want you to do this. I want you to take THE COURT: 20 these down, get with government's counsel and defense counsel, rather than handing me up a number of sheets --21 22 THE WITNESS: Okay. 23 THE COURT: -- extract the pages that have the 24 contested the images on them, give me only those sheets, and 25 have them clearly marked as to which they are.

```
1
             THE WITNESS: Yes, sir.
            MR. HOGUE: And I'll point this out, Your Honor, with
 2
     respect to the Court's use of the word "contested," neither
 3
     party here contest those.
 4
                         That may have been a misstatement.
 5
             THE COURT:
            MR. HOGUE:
                         Thank you, Your Honor.
 6
7
             THE COURT: I'm going to say questionable, because
      there's a question in the Court's mind.
8
            MR. HOGUE: Raised, I take it, by U.S. Probation, not
9
10
     by the government or the defense, though.
11
             THE COURT: Raised by the Court.
12
            MR. HOGUE:
                         Thank you, Your Honor.
13
      (Pause-Aside)
14
             THE COURT: All right. I'm holding one, two, three --
      four pages containing -- each containing small color
15
16
     photographs, and I'm going to mark this Court's Exhibit 1.
      (Aside)
17
            MR. HOGUE: Your Honor, are you getting to the further
18
19
      clarification that will be needed?
20
             THE COURT:
                         I'm trying to.
21
            MR. HOGUE:
                         I think we can help the Court do that.
22
             THE COURT: All right.
23
            MR. HOGUE: Because not every photo on those four
24
     pieces of paper is now being contended by the witness --
25
             THE COURT: I understand that. Ms. Ward says, that's
```

```
1
      on this first page, there's a little photograph here marked
     with an S.
 2
 3
             THE WITNESS: Yes, sir.
             THE COURT: And it's your judgment that that's
 4
 5
     pornographic?
 6
             THE WITNESS:
                           Right.
7
             THE COURT: And then on the second page, the second
     photograph down is marked with S by Ms. Ward, and that's
8
9
     another photograph that in your judgment is arguably
10
     pornographic?
11
             THE WITNESS: Yes, sir. And if I might clarify, it's
12
     not necessarily just the photo alone. It's the photo in
13
      conjunction with the conversations about having sex with the
      child and the bartering back and forth of something obviously
14
15
      that both parties on both ends want to have, for that purpose,
      for sexual -- so it's a combination of the picture and the
16
      chat that I feel is --
17
18
             THE COURT: Well, that raises another question now.
19
                         That's completely irrelevant.
            MR. HOGUE:
20
            THE WITNESS: Okay.
21
             THE COURT: Do you agree with that? I mean, I did not
22
     understand that it was a violation of law for people to chat
23
     back and forth on a computer about these things. It's the
24
      images that are the offense.
25
            MR. MCCOMMON: That's correct.
```

```
1
             THE WITNESS: Okay.
 2
             THE COURT: Is that correct?
 3
            MR. MCCOMMON: That's correct.
            THE COURT: Do you agree?
 4
 5
            MR. HOGUE:
                        I do.
            MR. MCCOMMON: The chat would show the intent.
 6
7
            THE WITNESS: Okay.
             THE COURT: All right. On the third page there are
8
9
      five pictures here, and the third one, is that -- do you
10
      contend that?
             THE WITNESS: Yes. And I apologize, I meant to put an
11
12
      S by that, rather than a three, I was counting, that's an S.
13
             THE COURT: All right. I'll put an S by it. And then
14
     on the fourth page, in the top row, the photograph second from
      the left on the top row?
15
16
             THE WITNESS: Yes.
17
             THE COURT: Okay. All right, this is Court's Exhibit
18
     C-1, and it's admitted, and we are all in agreement about the
19
     pictures, are we not, Mr. Hogue?
20
            MR. HOGUE: Yes, sir.
21
             THE COURT:
                        Do you want to look at that one more time?
22
                        Yes, if I may. Yes, we are in agreement as
            MR. HOGUE:
23
     to the four photographs marked.
24
             THE COURT: All right. Anything else anybody wants to
25
     say about these pictures? Diane --
```

1 (Aside) THE COURT: Yes, they'll be sealed. Mr. Hogue, 2 3 anything else? MR. HOGUE: With regard to the photos? 4 THE COURT: 5 Yes. MR. HOGUE: Well, simply this, Your Honor, just to get 6 7 us back to where we started. Both the government and the defense viewed them in discovery and negotiations, and both 8 the government and the defense concluded that they do not fit 9 the definition in the statute, and thus we negotiated our plea 10 11 deal accordingly, and that's why we both now object to 12 Paragraph 22. 13 THE COURT: All right. The Court has inspected these marked pictures in Exhibit C-1 and finds that on page one, 14 15 page one of Exhibit C-1, the middle photograph marked S meets 16 the definition of child pornography. 17 On page two, the second picture down from the top, that 18 meets the definition. 19 On page three, the third photograph down from the top, 20 does not meet the definition. 21 And on page four, the photograph in the top row, second 22 from the left, does not. 23 So we have two that do. Distribution is admitted. 24 overrule the objection to Paragraph 22. 25 MR. HOGUE: And, Your Honor, for clarity of the record,

```
1
     you're using, I presume, the definitions of child pornography
      and minors engaging in sexually explicit conduct that are set
 2
      out in 18 U.S.C. Section 2252 and 2256, I presume?
 3
             THE COURT: I don't have those statutes in front of me.
 4
      I will issue a written order.
 5
             MR. HOGUE:
                         Thank you.
 6
             THE COURT: Okay. That takes care of the objection to
7
      Paragraph 22. Paragraph 24 -- yes, anything else you want to
8
9
      say about that?
10
             MR. MCCOMMON: No, Your Honor.
             THE COURT: Mr. Hoque?
11
12
             MR. HOGUE: No, Your Honor.
13
             THE COURT: Where is Ms. Thomas? Come up here a
     minute.
14
      (Aside)
15
16
             MR. HOGUE: Your Honor, if I may add one further
      clarification to the Court's finding just now, I did cite the
17
18
      statute, but can I very briefly say what it includes as
19
     prohibited, to possess and distribute, and it would be a minor
20
      engaged in sexually explicit conduct, which the statute at 18
     U.S.C. Section 2256(2) defines as "actual or simulated," and
21
22
      there are five subparts, "sexual intercourse," and it breaks
23
      that down into all the different ways that can occur,
24
      "bestiality, masturbation, sadistic or sadistic abuse," and
25
      finally, "lascivious expedition of the genitals or pubic
```

```
1
      areas." So that's why we concluded in --
                         The Court's ruling is based on the last one
 2
             THE COURT:
 3
     you mentioned.
            MR. HOGUE: All right.
 4
             THE COURT: Anything else y'all want to say with
 5
     respect to Paragraph 24?
 6
7
            MR. HOGUE: That was 22, Your Honor.
             THE COURT: I understand, you and I just addressed
 8
     Paragraph 22, lascivious expedition.
9
10
            MR. HOGUE: Correct.
11
             THE COURT: I've ruled on Paragraph 22. I'm now
12
      considering the objection to Paragraph 24. Anything else
13
     anybody wants to say about that?
14
            MR. MCCOMMON: No, Your Honor.
15
             THE COURT: All right. It's apparent to me that there
16
     are many, many more images, 600 or more, a part of which were
17
      included on the hard drive and part of which were included in
      other forms.
18
19
           The government apparently has reservations about which
20
      images would pass evidentiary scrutiny in a trial, but I don't
     believe that that limits the Court's consideration of the
21
22
     other materials.
23
           The objection to Paragraph 24 is overruled. All right.
24
     Any there other objections?
25
            MR. MCCOMMON: Not from the government, Your Honor.
```

```
1
             THE COURT: Mr. Hogue?
 2
            MR. HOGUE: No. Those are our only objections to the
 3
     presentence report.
            THE COURT: All right. It's nearly lunch. I'm going
 4
      to recess until 1:30. I'll hear your arguments at that time
 5
      and impose sentence.
 6
            MR. HOGUE: May I ask for one consideration, Your
7
     Honor? I do have a plea hearing scheduled with Judge Ennis at
8
      1:30. I can call him and ask that to be changed or --
9
10
            THE COURT: Yes, do that.
11
            MR. HOGUE: I'll do that, Your Honor.
12
            THE COURT: All right. I also understand there are
13
     people who want to address the Court, and I'll hear whoever
14
     wants to.
15
      (RECONVENED; ALL PARTIES PRESENT, 1:30 p.m.)
16
            THE COURT: Be seated, please. All right. Does the
17
     government have anything else to say?
18
            MR. MCCOMMON: Your Honor, the only thing I'd like to
19
     do is the Court requested that I file with the Court the
20
     response of Mr. Marsh waiving restitution. So let me file
21
      that with the Court at this time. I'm filing a letter that I
22
     wrote to him on June 25th, and then an e-mail that he sent to
23
     me on July 14th withdrawing his request for restitution.
24
            THE COURT: Very good. Thank you. Let that be filed.
25
            MR. MCCOMMON: Nothing further.
```

1 THE COURT: All right. Mr. Hogue? MR. HOGUE: May I have one moment to confer with the 2 3 U.S. Attorney, Your Honor? THE COURT: Sure. 4 (Pause) 5 6 MR. MCCOMMON: Your Honor, the government has nothing 7 to offer further, but it's my understanding that Nancy Anderson, the ex-wife of the defendant, wants to address the 8 Court. 9 10 THE COURT: I'll be glad to hear from her. Ms. Anderson, you can come up and stand right there in front of 11 12 Identity yourself for the court reporter, please. me. 13 THE WITNESS: Nancy S. Anderson. 14 THE COURT: Proceed. 15 THE WITNESS: I appreciate the Court for letting me 16 speak today. April 21st, 2006 was the day I found out that 17 the man I had been married to for 16 years was involved in 18 child porn and was a pedophile. Lee had thousands of CDs and 19 videos at our house and the storage facility. What a shock. 20 Our lives changed forever. The direct victims were the images 21 of the naked boys and girls and many had bruises on their

has been over three years. The indirect victims are our children, your parents, Dr. and Mrs. Anderson, your sisters

legs. I still have flashbacks of the disgusting pictures I

saw, Lee, and hopefully they will diminish with time, but it

22

and their children, and myself. Our children will always have to deal with their father being a pedophile. That's just turned our world upsidedown, and I'm the one holding the bag trying to make things right. Your selfish actions went on for many, many years, unbeknownst to me. I was naive and trusting, and you used that to your advantage. It was such a violation of my trust in you, Lee --

THE COURT: Let me interrupt you, if I may,

Ms. Anderson. I'm glad to hear from you on any matter which

-- anything you have to say in furtherance of sentencing. I

understand that you harbor deep feelings of ill will and

resentment toward Mr. Anderson, but I'm not going to allow you

simply to stand here and castigate your former husband, you

know, just for your own satisfaction. That has no proper

place in this proceeding.

I have read your letter, word for word. I understand clearly what it says and how you feel, and I sympathize with you, but what you're doing now simply has no place in this proceeding. Now, if you want to continue on another vein or say anything else to me, I'll be glad to hear you.

THE WITNESS: Well, I feel like I am a victim and my children are a victim.

THE COURT: Yes, ma'am, you are indeed a victim. I'm in total agreement with you about that. But that does not entitle you to give a court-sanctioned lecture to your former

```
1
     husband, and you may not understand that, and I'm sorry if you
     don't, but that's going to be the rule.
 2
 3
             THE WITNESS: Okay.
             THE COURT: Is there anything else you'd like to say?
 4
 5
             THE WITNESS: No.
             THE COURT: Okay, thank you, ma'am.
 6
7
             THE WITNESS: Hopefully justice will be served.
             THE COURT: All right. Is there someone else?
 8
9
            MR. MCCOMMON: No, Your Honor, not from the government.
10
             THE COURT: Mr. Hogue, anyone else for you?
            MR. HOGUE: Yes, Your Honor. I know that the Court has
11
12
     received a number of letters.
13
             THE COURT: They've all been read.
                         There's about 15 or so of them. There are
14
            MR. HOGUE:
      some family members here. Two of them have expressed an
15
16
      interest in saying a few brief words to the Court in
      connection with sentencing. If the Court will allow Laura
17
18
     Edwards, who is Mr. Anderson's sister, and then his mother and
19
      father, if they could come forward, his mother would have a
20
      few words as well. Would you like them to come up
21
      individually, however?
22
             THE COURT: They can all come together if they like.
23
            MR. HOGUE: Doctor and Ms. Anderson, if you would come
24
     up as well. And, Ms. Edwards, introduce yourself to the Court
25
     and say your name for the court reporter.
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE WITNESS: I'm Laura Anderson Edwards, the sister of Lee, and I just want to ask for leniency. He's been a wonderful brother and an uncle to my children, and I've always trusted him with my children. I have two that are grown, and one that is 14. And I just beg your mercy. THE COURT: I understand. MR. HOGUE: Your Honor, this is Lee's parents, Mr. Anderson's parents, Dr. Anderson and Bobbi Anderson. THE COURT: Yes. **THE WITNESS:** I just want to ask for leniency for my son because we have not many years left for us, and we love our son, and we support him, and we will always support him. And for his -- actually he has a good relationship with his children, and for their sake, I think he needs to be in their life. That's all I have to say. I just plead for leniency. THE COURT: Yes, ma'am. Thank you, Ms. Anderson. Dr. Anderson? THE WITNESS: I have to speak for him. He does have bad health. I just have to speak for him. THE COURT: Very good. THE WITNESS: Thank you, Your Honor. MR. HOGUE: Your Honor, Mr. Anderson also would like to address the Court, and I'll say a few final words for him. THE COURT: All right, Mr. Anderson. THE DEFENDANT: Your Honor, it's hard, if not

impossible to express my sorrow for the hurt that I've caused so many people who are dear to me. My loved ones, innocent people, have received painful scars for life and have been hurt only because of their association and love for me.

The pain that I caused myself was self-inflicted, but the pain that they have endured is the pain that is hard for me to live with. I deserve my pain, but they don't deserve any pain.

Anyone who thinks that viewing pornography doesn't hurt anyone is wrong. Not only the victims of the pornographic images are hurt, but everyone that's dear to the person viewing them is also hurt. Viewing pornography on your computer is bringing a destructive force into your home.

Anyone who views pornography on a computer has a very good chance at some point of being sent some form of child pornography if they continue to view it. At that point they have several choices, and you must make a decision either to report the individual who sent the material to you, or take the cowardly action and try to ignore the images.

If you take no action because you're worried that your wife might find out that you're viewing pornography or that you might be afraid that you might get yourself in trouble, I say that anyone who may find themselves in that situation to stand up, and the only way to prevent the problem from spreading is to take the courageous action and report someone

who does send that type of material over the Internet.

Ignoring the act is ignoring the problem, and it's allowing the problem to continue to grow. Don't ignore the problem and seek help. Some good books that I've read that have helped me is Every Man's Battle by Steve Arterburn.

And I would say, if you are married, to seek marriage counseling and individual counseling, and if you're not married, please seek individual counseling on your own.

You can overcome the problem, but if you ignore the problem, then you, too have a good chance of ending up where I stand today, and that is, hurting the ones that you love, destroying your family, your career, your name, your reputation, all that you've cherished and worked so hard for, destroying the dreams for your loved ones as I have done.

The people who I have hurt by my actions have shown me nothing but unconditional love. I'm thankful for the three and a half years that I've had to rebuild these relationships, although the hurt that I have caused can slowly heal, the pain and the scars will always remain for both them and for me, but the pain that hurts the most is knowing that you've caused them pain. Knowing that I've hurt them hurts the most.

Although I'm a better father than I once was, my children have lost a father to be at their side in times of their joy and also to be there to comfort them in their time of distress. The time that we do get to share is always filled

with love and joy, although we all know that that time that we have to share together is for a short time until we get to see each other again.

I have not been able to participate in my children's life at all for the last six months, and I know that after today that time apart will be much longer. I want them to know that I love them and that I'm sorry for my actions. I ask and I hope that they can forgive me for not being there and for not being there for them in this critical time in their lives.

I ask them not to harden their hearts and to continue to love God and remember that God causes all things to work together for good for those who love him. To my parents who have stood by me and supported me, I want to again say that I'm sorry. They have always shown me unconditional love and have always taught me and shown me strong values.

I am sorry for disappointing and hurting them, and I treasure their love. They should be enjoying their golden years, yet I have hurt them deeply. Over the last three and a half years we have grown closer, but I'll never be able to make up for the hurt that I've caused them.

My sisters and their family have also been through much pain and hurt as a result of my actions. I am thankful for the love and support that they have give me, and I'm sorry for the hurt that I've caused them.

To my ex-wife Nancy I too am sorry for the pain and

disruption that I have caused in her life. Although we did have our problems, I never meant to hurt her, and I accept the blame.

Finally, to the Court, I apologize that my actions have caused me to appear before you today and that I've taken up valuable court time. I've tried to accept the responsibility for my actions and to minimize the use of the court's time and resources.

I ask for your grace and mercy today as you pronounce your sentence, and I have to live daily with the pain that I have caused the ones that I love. Your grace in sentencing will allow me to continue to rebuild and repair the hurt that I've caused my children, my parents, my ex-spouse, Nancy, and my siblings.

Every day that I'm allowed to spend with them is precious to me. I ask for an opportunity to continue to repair the hurt that I've caused while my children are still young and while I still have my parents with me. Thank you, sir.

THE COURT: All right, thank you.

MR. HOGUE: If Your Honor will allow me to a few concluding words on behalf of Mr. Anderson. As the Court well knows, justice in American criminal courts is achieved on a case by case basis. We don't achieve it in the abstract. So the question today is what's justice for John Lee Anderson, III in light of the crimes he's committed.

When we entered the case three and a half years ago, and that's how long ago this broke, and began our negotiations with the government, Mr. Anderson admitted to me and ultimately to the world that he was guilty, that he did possess and view child pornography.

So, I told the government that, and we waived the grand jury process and pled guilty to an information. We didn't want to put the government even to the burden of presenting the case to the grand jury, and that's what we did. No indictment was ever even drawn up.

Also, in negotiating what we believed to be, the government and defendant, a fair resolution for justice in our collective opinion, we negotiated to a result that we hoped — though we know Paragraph Five of the presentence report says none of what we negotiated is binding on this Court, and I'm well-aware of that — but we negotiated what we hoped would be a fair and just result, and that result would have been a sentencing range of 41 to 51 months.

I realize that by rulings made earlier today in this case we may not be in that range any longer. But those were matters that we looked hard at, negotiated about, and hoped that the Court would accept in accepting Mr. Anderson's plea and imposing sentence on him.

How much liberty should be taken from this man for what he's done? I'm asking the Court for some temperance and some

proportionality here. These are difficult crimes to deal with as a defense lawyer, as a prosecutor, as witnesses, and as the Court.

I've done many of them, as well as state cases involving child molestation, and I find in my own experience there's no kind of case that causes greater revulsion and emotional response than one involving children and sexual exploitation. Even murder cases don't get the kind of ire that these do.

So, the Court, I know, brings to the equation temperance and wisdom and can impose a sentence that's proportional. In our state system, for example, as the Court well knows, a person can face a minimum of five years, which is less than what Mr. Anderson is looking at here for actual molestation of a live child.

I don't say that to minimize what harm has been down here. I've read the victim impact statements. They're quite moving. Mr. Anderson has read them, and they cause him great pain, and he's expressed that just now to the Court.

So, I ask that the Court take into consideration a couple of other factors here that are not objections, of course, but just additional information, some of which is in the presentence report.

But for the last three and a half years since this came to light, Mr. Anderson has sought the assistance of Dr. Gene Able up in Atlanta near Emory University at a place called

Behavioral Medicine Institute of Atlanta where he underwent extensive testing to determine whether or not he fit the criteria of pedophilia.

The conclusion reached, after those independent tests, were that Mr. Anderson does not meet the diagnostic criteria for pedophilia, and further, Dr. Able recommended that he participate in specialized sex offender therapy, specifically a cognitive behavior therapy program with a strong relapse prevention component to help him gain control over his behavior.

He did that, and for some lengthy period of time he met regularly with a therapist in the Middle Georgia area dealing specifically with this issue. He has stayed off the computer. He's violated no conditions. He's, of course, been found not to be a danger to children as a pedophile, and further, took a polygraph test in which he answered questions and a polygrapher examiner said he passed concerning whether he had ever made any efforts to reach a live child to act in a further step to what he did in viewing child pornography.

There's no indication that he's ever harmed his own daughters, and to all accounts, he's been quite attentive and a good father to him, other than the pain he's caused by this act, of course.

Your Honor, just also in terms of proportionality, a couple of other things to consider. I know these don't have

to do with the loss of liberty that he's about to experience, but just so the Court will know other losses Mr. Anderson has suffered as a direct result of this.

Before this came to light he was living in a \$400,000 home with his two children and his wife. He was the vice president of commercial lending at a local bank. He had a good salary. His wife had a good salary. They lived a good life. They had good friends. They vacationed together. They had assets. They had a future.

He has lost every bit of that, and he, in fact, has been in jail in Bibb County since February of 2009 in civil contempt of divorce court because he was unable to sell a piece of property and convey the \$50,000 he owed as part of his divorce agreement. He attempted to sell it. It's still on the market.

I'm not sure, I wasn't his lawyer in that case, but it is a little puzzling to me that he would be found in contempt for not selling something no one would buy and has sat in jail for the last six months. Nevertheless, that's what's happened. He hasn't had representation in that matter these last few months, as I understand it.

In light of that, though, I'd like to ask this consideration of the Court, and I don't have any legal authority for it, but our first sentencing hearing was scheduled in this case April the 7th of 2009. There have been

delays since then, not occasioned that I can tell by any deliberate effort by anyone to delay the case, it's just one of those things, and it got delayed until now, late in July. Some of it perhaps may have been my own scheduling, but others not.

So I ask the Court to at least consider since April 7th, 2009, even though he was not technically in federal custody, credit for those three months and a half months, and the Court make that a part of its sentence. More than that, though, I'd like to ask the Court to impose a sentence that would be within the advisory guidelines, but that would come down to the range that we contemplated.

I come back at the end on this point with regard to that. I do know that the Court makes its own independent inquiry and judgment as to the facts. And I know that plea negotiations can be entered into in good faith between the parties and that they don't bind the Court.

But I also know that as a matter of practice and a matter of course, we lawyers do get accustomed to reaching plea deals that we've worked hard to get, and in the vast majority of the cases, as the Court well knows, the Court imposes a sentence in accordance with the judgment of those lawyers and the defendants themselves.

So it's difficult, it's difficult for the defense lawyer and for his client when that happens, and then we experience

what we've experienced today where we, both the government and the defendant, agreed to what we thought the facts should be, and the Court has found otherwise.

I understand and respect that process, but I ask that,
Your Honor, that you do find it appropriate for Mr. Anderson,
that justice for him means the loss of liberty only in the
range of the 41 to 51 months that we negotiated.

I will mention one last thing that hasn't been mentioned, but there was a provision in the plea agreement that the government would ask the Court, and it may have just been an oversight or the government assumes the Court is aware of it in the plea agreement, to impose the sentence at the low end of whatever guideline range the Court uses.

So that's a matter the government would ask for and has done so in its plea agreement, and we ask for that, likewise. Thank you, Your Honor.

MR. MCCOMMON: Nothing further.

THE COURT: All right. The guideline computations in this case, as a result of findings made by the Court in this hearing, begin with a base level of 18. Two points are added because the material involved included a prepubescent minor, or a minor who had not attained the age of 12 years. Two points are added under Paragraph 23 -- 22. We've discussed that.

Two points are added because the offense involved the use

of a computer for the possession, transmission, receipt, or distribution of the material, and five points are added because the offense involved 600 or more images. Three points are taken off for acceptance of responsibility.

The total offense level is 26, the criminal history category is one, and the range is 63 to 78 months.

Mr. Hogue, I acknowledge that you don't agree with Court's rulings on your objections, but the Court having ruled, do you agree with the computation?

MR. HOGUE: I do, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. The presentence report has been prepared, filed, considered, and accepted. The Court accepts it and adjudicates Mr. Anderson guilty of Count One of the indictment. The sentencing guidelines have been consulted and taken into account, and the Court has announced the range and offense level.

Mr. Anderson, the Court commits you to the Bureau of Prisons for a period of 70 months. Restitution, as we all understand, has been settled. There are no restitution issues.

The prison term is to be followed by a period of supervised release of 20 years. You shall report to the U.S. probation office in the district to which you are released within 72 hours of release from the custody of the Bureau of Prisons to begin service of the term of supervised release

which will include the standard and mandatory conditions, as well as the following special conditions:

First, you are prohibited from possessing a firearm or other dangerous weapon.

Second, you shall participate in a substance abuse program that may include testing to determine whether you have reverted to the use of drugs or alcohol, and may include treatment of alcohol and/or drug addiction or dependency.

The probation office shall administratively supervise your participation in the program by approving it, administering the testing, and supervising the treatment.

Third, you shall participate in a mental health program to include any sexual offender treatments as recommended by a psychiatrist or a psychologist. Such treatment may include mental health counseling, residential treatment, outpatient treatment, and/or the prescription of psychotropic medications by a medical doctor.

The probation office shall administratively supervise your participation in the program by approving it, and monitoring your participation in it.

Fourth, you shall register with the state sex offender registration agency in the state where you reside, work, or are a student as directed by the probation officer.

Fifth, you shall not use nor own any device which allows

Internet access, other than those which are authorized by this

court and administered by the probation officer. This includes, but is not limited to, personal digital assistance, electronic games, web TV solutions, Internet appliances, and cellular devices.

You shall not make repairs, modifications, or install software on authorized computer systems or cellular devices without pre-approval by the probation office.

You may only access e-mail accounts, chat rooms, instant messaging services, and/or other online environments which allow for user interaction via pre-approved and authorized accounts.

You shall not view, access, possess, and/or download any pornography. This includes, but is not limited to, images of minors.

You shall not possess nor use removable media configured with bootable operating systems. You shall submit your computer, associated hardware, and digital media for monitoring and review by the probation office upon request. This includes review of your Internet-capable cellular device.

Sixth, you shall provide financial information to the probation officer upon request.

Seven, you are prohibited from incurring new credit charges or opening additional lines of credit without the approval of the probation office.

And, eight, you shall cooperate in the collection of DNA

as directed by the probation officer. A mandatory assessment in amount of \$100 is imposed.

It's my opinion you are not able nor likely to become able to pay all or part of a fine even with the use of a reasonable installment schedule. I therefore waive the fine, as well as any alternative sanctions.

The sentence as imposed is an appropriate sentence in this case, complies with the factors that are to be considered as set forth at 18 U.S.C. 3553(a), and adequately addresses the totality of the circumstances.

Now, Mr. Anderson, you have knowingly and voluntarily waived your statutory right to appeal this sentence with certain exceptions as specified in your plea agreement.

But if you decide to appeal the sentence based on one of these exceptions, you must file a notice of appeal with the clerk of this court within ten days of judgment being entered in the case.

If you decide to appeal, you're entitled to be represented by a lawyer, and Mr. Hogue will continue as your counsel. Do you understand the sentence I've imposed?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir, I do.

**THE COURT:** Do you have any questions or objections?

THE DEFENDANT: No, sir.

THE COURT: Mr. Hoque, do you understand the sentence?

MR. HOGUE: I do.

**THE COURT:** Questions or objections?

MR. HOGUE: One request. Voluntary surrender. If I may briefly say why. But for the civil contempt, Mr. Anderson would have walked in here from the street where he's been on bond for the last several years, and the possibility exists that he may be able to purge himself of that contempt, he's hoping so, and be released from custody.

The Bureau of Prisons may take 60 days or more before they can place him, and given the length of the sentence, Mr. Anderson requests that he be allowed to post bond for voluntary sentence so that he may spend some time concluding his affairs and spending it with his aging parents before he goes off to do this 70-month sentence.

MR. MCCOMMON: Your Honor, may we address this if it becomes -- if he actually gets out of jail? I'm not sure as I stand here if there's any statute that we need to be aware of as to whether or not he can voluntarily surrender.

MR. HOGUE: There's no statutory impediment to it.

This is a crime for which he could, if the Court decides to allow it. I believe it was specified to us in one of the cover letters we got with the PSR, as well, and I didn't find any disqualifications for the Court to grant this.

And again, had he not been in contempt, he would have walked in here, and I don't think the statute would have required the Court to take him into custody today. In fact,

```
1
      I'm sure it would not require that.
 2
            MR. MCCOMMON: Your Honor, my only comment would be
 3
      that if the Court does grant voluntary surrender, that the
     Court might want to consider some conditions over what the
 4
      Court would normally do in terms of reporting, so forth.
 5
 6
            MR. HOGUE: He would comply, of course, with any
7
      condition if he's allowed to surrender voluntarily.
             THE COURT: Well, the law does not require a court to
8
     do a useless thing. As of this moment he's incarcerated under
9
10
      the order of superior court. If he is released by the
11
      superior court, you are welcome to bring an immediate motion
12
      to my attention, and I will rule on it at the time.
13
            MR. HOGUE: All right.
             THE COURT: Okay. That's all. Mr. Hoque?
14
15
            MR. HOGUE: Yes, sir.
16
             THE COURT: In the Anderson case, you are directed to
17
      file either a timely notice of appeal or a waiver signed by
18
     yourself or your client.
19
            MR. HOGUE: Yes, sir.
20
             THE COURT: Very good.
21
22
                   (SENTENCING HEARING CONCLUDED)
23
24
25
```

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER I HEREBY CERTIFY THAT THE FOREGOING IS A CORRECT TRANSCRIPT FROM THE RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS IN THE ABOVE-ENTITLED MATTER THIS 28th DAY OF OCTOBER, 2010 s/ SALLY L. GRAY, USCR, U.S. DISTRICT COURT-MIDDLE DISTRICT OF GEORGIA E-mail: Sally\_Gray@gamd.uscourts.gov